

REMARKS

Entry of this amendment and favorable reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claims 4-6, 8, 9 and 14-18 remain in the case.

The only art rejection still adhered to by the Examiner is under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a), the claims being unpatentable over Tanamura et al.. The previous rejections over Tokia et al. and Briney et al. are no longer adhered to by the Examiner.

It is submitted that the rejection over Tanamura et al. equally lacks viability. Thus, the invention relates to a barrier rib for an EL display element which is formed from a radiation sensitive resin composition comprising (A) an alkali soluble resin selected from the group consisting of a novolak resin, a homopolymer of a radical polymerizable monomer having a phenolic hydroxyl group, a homopolymer of a radical polymerizable monomer having a carboxyl group, and a copolymer of at least one unsaturated carboxylic monomer selected from the group consisting of an unsaturated carboxylic acid and an unsaturated carboxylic anhydride, an epoxy group-containing unsaturated compound and another olefinic unsaturated compound other than said at least one unsaturated carboxylic monomer and said epoxy-group-containing unsaturated compound, (B) a polymerizable compound having an ethylenically unsaturated bond, and (C) a radiation sensitive polymerization initiator, on a substrate, said barrier rib having a trapezoidal cross sectional form with a longer top side than the bottom side on the substrate and an angle formed by a straight line connecting the upper pattern edge and the lower pattern edge and the top side of 15 to 75°.

Tanamura et al. clearly fails to teach, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102, nor make obvious, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103, Applicants' discovery as defined by the claims. More specifically, the claims differ in the nature of the alkali soluble resin (A), as now specifically defined by the claims. Nowhere in Tanamura et al. is there any disclosure of

a copolymer derived from an epoxy group-containing unsaturated monomer. Further, in the examples of Tanamura et al., as note in Examples 1, 2, 4 and 5, a copolymer of styrene, α -methylstyrene, acrylic acid and (2-hydroxy-4-acryloyloxymethylphenyl) acrylate (molar ratio = 45:15:20:20) is present. This copolymer does not comprise an epoxy group-containing unsaturated compound (monomer), nor is it within the scope of the present claims. Manifestly, thus, anticipation, within the meaning of § 102 of Statute requiring complete identity in the prior art is not present.

Further, due to the particular nature of the claimed barrier material superior results are obtained with regard to having excellent heat resistance and adhesion, as so shown in the examples of the case. Such clearly rebuts any possible prima facie case of obviousness conceivably made out by the reference, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Further, with regard to the additional limitations of Claims 8 and 16-18, the following is pointed out. By controlling the amount of the volatile component, the entry of impurities into the EL layer can be prevented, thereby making it possible to prevent such problems as the occurrence of a lighting failure of the EL display element and a reduction in the brightness of emitted light. Such also is not disclosed by the reference, nor necessarily inherent.

Moreover, when the barrier rib of the present invention contains a colorant, it has light screening properties and preferably an OD value of 0.1 or more when it has a film thickness of 1 μm . When the OD value is smaller than 0.1, the light emitted from EL easily transmits the barrier rib and it is difficult to prevent a reduction in light emission contrast. Thus, the additional limitation as called for by Claim 6 providing for unobviously superior results also is not disclosed by the art.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 102 is requested.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 8 and 16-18 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, the claims have been amended in a manner believed to obviate this rejection. Specifically, it has now been made clear in the claim how the amount of a volatile component present in the barrier rib is determined. It is the volatile component which may have been introduced into the composition in making the barrier rib that is evaluated by a method as now so specifically defined by the claims. Note page 44, lines 5-12 of the specification. By so controlling the amount of volatile component being present, this makes it possible to prevent occurrence of lighting failure of the EO display element and a reduction in the brightness of emitted light.

Should any further amendment to the claims be considered necessary by the Examiner, he is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone so that mutually agreeable language may be arrived at.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, thus is requested.

It is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance and which is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Samuel H. Blech
Registration No. 32,082

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
NFO:SHB/bu